



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/231,415	01/14/1999	DON P. WOLFE	AUTOB.043A	3041

20995 7590 08/05/2003

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

COLBERT, ELLA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3624

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/231,415

Applicant(s)

WOLFE ET AL. *CB*

Examiner

Ella Colbert

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-41 and 77-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-41 and 77-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 26-41 and new claims 77-86 are pending. Claims 77-86 have been added, and claims 26, 27, and 34 have been amended in this communication filed 06/03/03 entered as Amendment A and Extension of Time, paper no. 12.
2. The Claim Objection of misnumbered claim 42 has been overcome by the renumbering of claim 42 and is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1 and 83 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 recites "..., each purchase request belonging to at least one set and fewer than all sets;". It is not clear in the claim language what Applicants' mean by the "at least one set and fewer than all sets". Do Applicants' mean "at least one set of purchase requests and fewer than all sets of purchase requests"? Claim 83, recites "... wherein each purchase request belongs to only one set". It is not clear what Applicants' mean by "... wherein each purchase request belongs to only one set". Do Applicants' mean "... wherein each purchase request belongs to only one purchase request set" or "... wherein each purchase request belongs to only one set of purchase requests"?

Art Unit: 3624

Claim Objections

5. Claims 30 and 31 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 30 and 31 are duplicate claims reciting the same limitation and depending on the same dependent claim 29. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 26-41 and 77-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,592,375) Salmon et al, hereafter Salmon in view of "Computerized Selling: Dealership systems now track customers along with the bills and payroll" by Charles M. Thomas, hereafter Thomas.

With respect to claim 26, Salmon teaches, a purchase request management system, wherein said purchase request is remotely managed by a user over a computer network, said purchase request management system comprising:

a system database comprising a plurality of set of purchase requests received from potential buyers and stored in the database, each of purchase requests associated with one of a plurality of dealers, each purchase request belonging to at least one set and fewer than all sets (col. 3, lines 14-37 and lines 54-67, col. 4, lines 1-7, and fig. 3a (element 100)). Salmon did not teach, a purchase request management module that permits each dealer to access and manage only the set of purchase requests

Art Unit: 3624

associated with the dealer. Thomas discloses, a purchase request management module that permits each dealer to access and manage only the set of purchase requests associated with the dealer (page 2, lines paragraph 3- paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a purchase request management module that permits each dealer to access and manage only the set of purchase requests associated with the dealer and to modify in Salmon in view of Salmon's teachings of a seller's interface (dealer) and the use of a database manager to collect product profile information in col. 3, lines 49-56 and because such a modification would allow Salmon to perform responses to the purchase request by a user.

With respect to claim 27, Salmon and Thomas did not teach, the management system as additionally comprising a dealer terminal, said dealer terminal displaying a split screen and the split screen lists the purchase requests on one side and a purchase request detail on the other side, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the management system to additionally comprise a dealer terminal with the dealer terminal displaying a split screen and the split screen lists the purchase requests on one side and a purchase request detail on the other side and to modify in view of Salmon's teachings of the buyer's interface presenting a particular screen in col. 4, lines 26-67, col. 5, lines 1-4, and figs. 2d-2f and because such a modification would allow Salmon and Thomas the capability of identify text and images associated with the product profile on the screen.

Art Unit: 3624

With respect to claim 28, Salmon teaches, wherein said list of purchase requests includes an assigned user (col. 8, lines 4-24 and figs. 7e- 7f).

With respect to claim 29, Salmon teaches, wherein said purchase request details includes a purchase request task list (col. 8, lines 32-39).

With respect to claim 30, Salmon teaches, wherein said purchase request task list includes an assigned user (col. 8, lines 57-67 and col. 9, lines 1-2 and lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 31, Salmon teaches, wherein said purchase request task list includes an assigning user (col. 8, lines 30-67).

With respect to claim 32, Salmon did not teach, wherein said user is a sales manager.

Thomas discloses, wherein said user is a sales manager (page 2, paragraph 17). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a user as a sales manager and to modify in Salmon because such a modification would allow Salmon to sell a broad range of sales modules aimed at showroom traffic control.

With respect to claim 33, Salmon did not teach, wherein said user is a salesperson.

Thomas discloses, wherein said user is a salesperson (page 2, paragraphs 2-7). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a user as a salesperson and to modify in Salmon because such a modification would allow Salmon to track contacts made by the salesmen at the end of each day by the computer being linked to the dealership's phone system.

Art Unit: 3624

With respect to claim 34, Salmon teaches, a purchase request management system comprising: means for storing a plurality of sets of purchase requests received from potential buyers, wherein each set of purchase requests is associated with one of a plurality of dealers and each purchase request belongs to at least one set and fewer than all sets (col. 3, lines 49-58); means for listing only the set of purchase requests (col. 3, lines 22-27); means for selecting said purchase request (col. 3, lines 49-58); means for displaying details of the listed set of purchase requests (col. 3, lines 59-67 and col. 4, lines 1-25). Salmon and Thomas did not teach, means for acting on the listed set of purchase requests, wherein said acting includes utilizing one or more action response modules, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a means for acting on said purchase request, wherein said acting includes utilizing one or more action response modules and in view of Salmon's teachings of the seller selecting from among the categories of additional information to add and presenting a series of questions in col. 6, lines 46-60 and col. 7, lines 32-38 and because such a modification would allow Salmon to have more flexibility in responses to purchase requests.

With respect to claim 35, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 27.

With respect to claim 36, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 28.

With respect to claim 37, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 29.

Art Unit: 3624

With respect to claim 38, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 30.

With respect to claim 39, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 31.

With respect to claim 40, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 32.

With respect to claim 41, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 33.

With respect to claim 77, Salmon teaches, wherein a user remotely accesses the management system (col. 2, lines 41-55).

With respect to claim 78, Salmon did not teach, wherein accessing and managing purchase requests as permitted by the purchase request management module includes storing a status indicator associated with each purchase request. Thomas discloses, wherein accessing and managing purchase requests as permitted by the purchase request management module includes storing a status indicator associated with each purchase request (Page 1, paragraph 8). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to access and manage purchase requests as permitted by the purchase request management module includes storing a status indicator associated with each purchase request and to modify in Salmon because such a modification would allow Salmon to know the budgets, trade-in information, needs of a customer, and whether the customer is a good prospect.

Art Unit: 3624

With respect to claim 79, Salmon did not teach, wherein the status indicator is selected from a group including at least quoted, pending, and sold. Thomas discloses, wherein the status indicator is selected from a group including at least quoted, pending, and sold (Page 1, paragraph 12 – paragraph 15). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the status indicator selected from a group including at least quoted, pending, and sold and to modify in Salmon because such a modification would allow Salmon to have access to information about the prospective customer, to track information, and to develop sales.

With respect to claim 80, Salmon teaches, wherein accessing and managing purchase requests as permitted by the purchase request management module includes associating a task with a purchase request (col. 2, lines 53-56).

With respect to claim 81, Salmon teaches, wherein accessing and managing purchase requests as permitted by the purchase request management module includes assigning a task to a user (col. 3, lines 38-41).

With respect to claim 82, Salmon teaches, wherein accessing and managing purchase requests as permitted by the purchase request management module includes assigning a priority level to a purchase request (col. 3, lines 54-58).

With respect to claim 83, Salmon teaches, wherein each purchase request belongs to only one set (col. 4, lines 58-64).

With respect to claim 84, Salmon teaches, further comprising a plurality of distinct database regions, wherein each set is stored in one database region (col. 4, lines 64-67 and col. 5, lines 1-37).

With respect to claim 85, Salmon teaches, wherein each database region is associated with one dealer (col. 5, lines 47-60).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 26-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicants' disclosure.

Green et al (US 6,041,310) disclosed a system for facilitating automobile transactions.

Brent et al (US 6,006,201) disclosed an on-line motor vehicle auction and motor vehicle sales.

Johnson (US 5,493,490) disclosed an electronic system for selling automobiles.

Inquiries

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 am -5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1038. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for Official communications and 703-746-5622 for Unofficial communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/231,415

Page 10

Art Unit: 3624

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.



E. Colbert
August 2, 2003